



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

JULY,

1894.

ANNALS  
OF THE  
AMERICAN ACADEMY  
OF  
POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE.

---

THE FUTURE PROBLEM OF CHARITY AND THE  
UNEMPLOYED.\*

No clear word upon this ugly subject is possible without constant reference to a new social feeling which has at last become very intense. Democracy, with its passion for equality of opportunity, has now so far developed as to introduce into the questions of charity and the unemployed an element as new as it is formidable. By its newness I mean rather that a volume of social feeling has become conscious of itself in a new way. The masses have at last got political power so organized that it can be brought to bear on social legislation. The clear consciousness of this fact is intensifying the "social problem" at every point, and making it far

\*I am aware that the "Knights of the Panacea" will be impatient of the slow disciplinary influences offered in this paper. It seems safe to assume that whatever changes take place with the "economic rent," or along the lines of municipal socialism, "to steady employment," etc., or for fewer hours, such agencies and especially such *training* as are here indicated will still be necessary. Whatever development socialism or the single tax may have, some kind of an "estate"—fifth or sixth?—will yet remain for any future which it is worth while to discuss. Meantime the remedies offered will not stand in the way of any increase in socializing rent, or profits, or interest.

more difficult to meet. Though it appears in several countries, there are special reasons why we see this change more clearly in France and England than elsewhere.

The socialism of the St. Simon type was careful to keep out of politics, but, as with the English trade-unions, the last dozen years have shown a direct and rapid tendency into politics. I do not mean general politics but that part of politics which concerns industrial legislation. For weal or woe the masses have come to believe that they can make or unmake laws in such way as to change to their advantage the industrial system. The fact which is new and formidable is that the masses have at last come to believe this. What other classes in history have done when in possession of government, the democracy will try to do. Will they blunder worse than their predecessors? It is quite possible, but it is certain that the "passion for equality of opportunity" is in politics to stay. It is this which within ten years has put into the French Chamber of Deputies sixty socialist members. It is this which has given to their trade-unions a power which the government cannot for a moment ignore. It is this which has put city councilors into power in more than eighty communes and given to several large cities socialist mayors. It is this sense of new and direct influence in politics which is working even greater changes in England, in rapidly increasing numbers of workingmen among magistrates, inspectors and poor law guardians: the new attitude of the government toward the eight-hour question, the establishment of a Labor Department, the new form of the Employers' Liability Act and the Parish Council Bill, with all that this implies of democratic administration as against the control of the squire and the parson, all spring from the same source. But in what ways does this new sense of power in social questions affect the problems of charity and the unemployed? The relation is as direct as it is practicable. Whether in France or New Zealand, Denmark or England, every proposed change in the poor laws shows

the same concern about the democracy. Its claims, its feelings must be conciliated. In the new draft of the Denmark law we read, "the law must not (as of old) violate the sense of independence among the poor." This is expressed even more strongly in recent proposals in the New Zealand law. Mr. Fowler, as member of the English government, thinks evidently that the attempt to disgrace the poor by the severities of indoor relief cannot be allowed to continue.\* Against Peel's opinion that no public relief should be considered honorable, we now have an almost violent reaction among many of the ablest men in England. Politicians like Chamberlain, Gorst and Hunter, trained workers in charity like Moor Ede and Samuel Barnett, economists like Marshall, statisticians like Charles Booth. These men are now found protesting loudly against the assumed sufficiency of any possible administration of the present poor law or workhouse test. The whole movement in England toward some form of old age insurance rests upon the admission that a large part of the poor have been unfairly and inadequately dealt with. The real facts as to the degree of poverty in the English working classes were ignored until they won the support of Charles Booth's authoritative sanction.

The Hon. Arthur Aclaird said: "So far as they go [Mr.

\* There is great significance in the attitude of very different types of governments at the present moment on this subject. The new law in Denmark reads: "The repugnance felt by the decent poor towards the workhouse and their readiness to endure considerable privation rather than enter it, *is reasonable*," etc. The last annual of the New Zealand Report of the Bureau of Industries, says: "The present system of charitable aid is faulty in the extreme—." In November, 1892, in a circular issued by the English Local Government Board, we read, "The spirit of independence which leads so many of the working classes to make great personal sacrifices rather than incur the stigma of pauperism, is one that deserves the greatest sympathy," etc. "What is required in the endeavor to relieve artisans and others who have hitherto avoided poor law assistance, and who are temporarily out of employment, is—I. Work which will not involve the stigma of pauperism," etc.

We see the same thing in the enormous petition now going to the Swiss Federation for the legal changes which shall admit the "right to work." All this, whether desirable or otherwise, is a world movement that grows apace with the extension of an educated democracy. It means not only a sharper distinction between poverty and pauperism, but that clearly undeserved want should be dealt with upon principles which the official and voluntary charities have refused to recognize.

Booth's figures] they seriously disturb the comfortable belief of those who sometimes speak as though old age pauperism were largely the fault of the paupers, and therefore to be treated only by deterrent methods."

I have here no opinion to express on the English scheme to meet this pauperism by old age pensions, but, as the plan turned solely upon the question of poverty, the opinions as to the need of some new method other than the old charity are of course to the point. The change of opinion in England is only what we find in several other countries where the two phenomena are found together: a highly developed industrial life and a highly developed democratic sentiment. Where this sentiment has learned its politics best; where it has best learned the arts of using this new political influence, there we find the most radical proposals to revolutionize charity methods and to face the spectre of the unemployed with other weapons.

Look for a moment at the discussion in England. Mr. Booth, in his address before the Statistical Society,\* showed how he feared every exaggeration of pauperism, and yet how appalling the figures were. The plain record of facts as he finds them, drove him to remedies and proposals which seem extreme. He finds "two out of every five men and women who live to be sixty-five are destined, under existing circumstances, to become chargeable to the poor rates, to be a burden upon the poor law. Influential papers which ridiculed socialist writers seven years ago for a moderate statement of the evil, now practically accept Mr. Booth's figures. Mr. Chamberlain says:

"I want to tell you two things which are worth bearing in mind. Of every man and woman who is to-day living at the age of twenty-five, one out of two will live, according to the tables, to the age of sixty-five. I often hear people say, 'Oh, working people do not live to sixty-five.' There is no greater mistake. There are at the present time 2,000,000

\* *Journal*, December, 1891.

in the United Kingdom over sixty-five, and the majority of them belong to the working classes. One out of two—remember that—will live to be sixty-five. The second point—and this is more serious—is that, out of those who live to be sixty-five under present conditions, forty per cent, two out of five will be paupers, will have to depend for their subsistence upon poor law relief. This is a matter which I have calculated for myself and for which I have given my authority on previous occasions. But the figures I am quoting now are not my own. I have got a better authority than any I could give. They have been sent to me by the kindness of Mr. Charles Booth, who is well known as the greatest living authority upon pauperism and the condition of the poor."

In the editorial comments of the *Times* we read, "Mr. Booth's figures justify Mr. Chamberlain." "He gives statements precise as a balance sheet, dealing with points vitally material to any old age pension scheme;" and Mr. Chamberlain's "arguments for such a scheme have been much strengthened by Mr. Booth's paper." Even the *Daily News* finds no objection on principle. It says: "It can not be too carefully borne in mind that, in providing universally for old age, we should not be so much taking up a burden as readjusting it." The poor are now "cared for in the way most unsatisfactory possible, . . . in a way discouraging to thrift and effort, degrading to the old people, often cruelly burdensome. Sooner or later we shall amend this; . . . it will not be by the exercise of any intricate ingenuity, but by a *bold humanitarian recognition of a public duty to those great masses who have spent their lives in the public service.*" This final sentence is to the letter as if written by some socialist of the chair in 1878-1879, when the discussion of state insurance was becoming public in Germany.

With the general proposition of old age insurance, Mr. John Morley expresses distinct sympathy: "I have taken great interest in the subject, and have ventured to say that I

think the man or the party who solves this question—the question of preventing a man who has worked hard all his life, maintained his family, and been a good citizen, from going in his old age to the workhouse—the man who shall put an end to that state of things will deserve more glory than if he had won battles in the field.” At Sheffield Mr. Morley said: “Could not the State use its influence in the direction of something like national insurance? The most afflicting thing to be seen in modern society is that after men have spent their natural force they were so often left beggars.”

Mr. Ede, formerly lecturer upon political economy at Cambridge, writes out of a long experience, in the *Contemporary Review*, April, 1891, that, in his opinion, the trade-unions, even with the help of the friendly societies, can not begin to deal with this question, since they touch only the more successful body of laborers, not the great mass of the unskilled. To those who hope that the “thrift movement” will finally reach these masses, he says: “Is it reasonable to expect such thrift of the average agricultural laborer? . . . Forty-five per cent of the deaths over sixty years of age were those of persons who had been in receipt of poor relief, *i. e.*, nearly one-half over sixty were paupers. Can we expect such thrift from the unskilled laborers in towns whose average wage in consequence of irregularity of employment is scarcely, if at all, above that of the agriculturalists? Manifestly we can not.” Of London he says: “One in five of the deaths occurs in a workhouse or public hospital. If we eliminate those above the wage-earners the proportion will be something like one in three for all ages. If we take those of sixty and upwards, one in two will more accurately represent the proportion. . . .

“Four hundred and ninety thousand persons over sixty-five years of age in receipt of relief during the year—over one in three of the whole population of that age—and even this takes no account of lunatics or the large number who struggle on in feeble bodily health, or eke out an existence

of semi-starvation on their little savings, dreading nothing so much as that they should survive their slender store and be driven to the parish, and the house at last."

He asks if it is more ignoble that these should receive pensions than that more than 100,000 in the army, police, navy and civil service should receive them.

Dr. Spence Watson writes: "My hope and belief is that a carefully considered scheme may succeed in preventing those who have labored through life in the service of the State being compelled, in their declining days, to seek a refuge in the poorhouse."

It has been the theory of the poor law reform act of 1834 that "fear of want" was the great safeguard against pauperism. There is now experience enough to make one statement about this fear argument very safe, namely: that large classes of laborers are almost wholly unmoved by it. Fear of want has no such influence upon them as the theory presupposes. The statement is equally safe that large classes are, on the contrary, very powerfully affected by whatever adds hopefulness to their lot. A German biologist\* has shown that the "hunger argument" has done in the lower animal world far too much service. It seems quite as true of the "fear of want" argument in the question of pauperism. "Sense of security and hopefulness" upon purely economic grounds are everywhere found to have unexpected values.

Mr. Booth uses the socialist argument (Professor Marshall seems to agree with him) that the hopefulness which a feeling of economic security gives is of far greater promise. With such experience as we have at command, it is impossible to deny that this may prove true so far as the principle can be applied. It is moreover a point of extreme practical importance, since sentiment is becoming so powerful a factor in social politics that the voters are not in the least likely to sympathize with any such stringent application of the poor

\*" *Biologische Probleme*," von Dr. Rolph, Leipzig, 1884.



law as this "fear of want" argument implies. The "science of the possible" must more and more take this sensitive mass of feeling in the rising demos into account.

This is accurately what the leading politicians of the world are being forced to do in these questions of charity and relief. Four years after the law had been changed in France allowing the trade-unions practically free swing, M. Floquet, Minister of the Interior, said in 1888 what every minister now repeats after him, that the principles of the Revolution of 1789 must be accepted. M. Floquet was speaking upon charity and he did not hesitate to take his text from the "Declaration of Rights." He said :

"In opening your first session, let me remind you that you are descended from the French Revolution, and that your appropriate task is a preserving effort to put into practice the ideas of which it was the exponent and to act as the executors of its will.

"When, for a moment, in 1848, the spirit of the Revolution again flashed forth, a new attempt was made to give fresh impetus to the great principle of *social solidarity* and to organize a system of public charity. Since then, no general law on this subject has been enacted. Little by little, piecemeal, our existing laws have grown up. But the same spirit—that of the Revolution—animates these fragments. In every branch of the public charitable service, the recollection of the principles formulated by the convention regulates the relations between the assisted and the government.

"The aim of every democratic government should be to realize in practice the principle of social solidarity consecrated by the French Revolution."

There are two tendencies in French charities: one toward a substitution of an obligatory principle for a voluntary one; the other toward throwing the obligations upon the commune, and it is of more than ordinary significance to compare the charity principles of '89 to which Floquet refers with what is now attempting in those communes in which the

socialists have won power upon the city councils. Every revolution in France which has brought the democratic spirit to the front, has brought an attack upon the prevailing forms and methods of charity. What the Bastille symbolized was not more hateful than what was implied by the institutions and the word charity. Disgrace was associated with *l'hôpital*; it is thus erased and *maison de santé* put in its place. The common term *bureau de charité* was changed into *bureau de bienfaisance*, and the word foundling into *enfant naturel de la patrie*. This was more than playfulness, the attempt to change the entire conception of caring for the unfortunate was made with a sort of passion. Taine has shown how direct and powerful an influence Rousseau exercised upon those sympathies out of which charity springs; but Rousseau furnished a social theory quite as important. If society to its very heart is corrupt, the decay of the individual is a fatality; if out of work or penniless or sick, the fault is not his, but society's. If we add to this the theory of equality and the natural dignity of human nature we see that any influence which leads large masses honestly and passionately to believe such doctrines, will lead to action and to practice. Such action and practice have followed in every outburst of democratic sentiment, 1830, 1848, 1871. The first objects of this sentiment are the questions of charity and the unemployed. In quite twenty of the communes at the present moment attempts are making to carry out the spirit of the Revolution and remove every sign of disgrace, raise the standard of living; in a word, to act with the poor as if they were not to blame, but society rather.

Let us be wholly clear as to this point. The more advanced sections of the democracy, those sections that are organized for greatest influence, have either accepted these views about charity and the unemployed or they are rapidly coming to accept them. In Boston, during the past winter, not alone in the crowded Fanueil Hall gatherings or in "Equity Union," but in the constant discussion of these questions at

the different trade-union centres, the same bitterness showed itself against charity and against every assumption that individuals were to blame for being poor or out of work.

Europe has long been familiar with such opinions, but they are for the most part new with us. Nor need we hoodwink ourselves by supposing that such opinions will pass away even if the business depression soon ceases. Socialistic agitation has at last too many centres established among us; the literature of agitation is spreading too widely and too rapidly, and the whole movement of organized labor shows such increasing socialistic sympathy, that the entire problem of charity and the unemployed will no longer be free from this new influence. We have seen, too, that this antagonism against the older ideas of charity is shared by many names of commanding influence. Governments are showing this new feeling as distinctly as individuals. The boldest scheme of social legislation is State insurance of the laboring classes. It is in every country assumed by the advocates of these measures that economic insecurity, in the present conditions of the world-market, is a constant peril of so grave a character that society has no right to act as if the individual laborer could meet all the exigencies. This legislation assumes that the causes of much poverty and out of work are strictly social. "*Le risque professionnel*" (trade responsibility) is an attempt to recognize a larger responsibility than that of the individual.

There is thus every justification for the laborer to turn upon his opponent with words that I once heard: "Your economists and your politicians are both hurrying to admit that the chief causes of poverty and the unemployed are social." If there is some exaggeration in this there is also essential truth in it.

I cannot therefore think it of prime importance to search for the causes of poverty and want of work. It is not even of importance to settle the question of rights among these opinions. Even if we believed strongly that the new views

were dangerous, and that the older charity methods *ought* to suffice, we are met by the sinister fact that a powerful minority hotly maintains that the older methods are both false and intolerable. Here then, in the growing mass of this opposition, is the first obstacle with which we must reckon. Our problem is not one of theory but of troublesome practice. The angry irritation against the old charity springs straight from a democratic sentiment which has become conscious of political power. The socialist mayor of St. Ouen, in France, says, "We must first stop the ignominy of putting a stigma upon the poor by forcing them upon charity. Charity is an obliquy. It tries to prevent people becoming poor by holding over them the fear of social disgrace, but as the social system now creates most of the poverty it is a cruelty to make the victim responsible."

The workhouse uniform was therefore to be taken off and the recipients of relief allowed to go free with an extra subsidy in their pockets. The natural dignity of the individual was to be restored. By free feeding of the children of the poor in the public schools and kindergartens; by the municipalized drug store and the free distribution of medicines among the needy, it is proposed to raise the standard of living—sanitary and economic—rather than trust to the older charity. Mayor Walter, of St. Denis, goes to a widow with four young children and says to her, "You have applied for charity. It is true you cannot support yourself and properly rear your children without help, but charity will spoil you and possibly your children. I will take your children in the name of the commune. They shall be clothed and fed and educated, you meantime earning your own living and having free access to your family, which shall be restored to you when they have passed through the schools, or you are able to support the burden without charity." As wild as this sounds, a very powerful opinion is growing up in favor of something very like this measure. The actual observations of the evil effects of the ordinary

charity upon a family are such as to force more and more of the thoughtful and experienced to ask if, after all, there isn't a better way than to go on trying to check poverty by holding up the poorhouse, loss of citizenship, or any other mere intimidation as if it were an adequate preventive, to say nothing of its justice or injustice. Growing doubts, both as to the adequacy and the justice of the "fear of poverty" argument are what have driven such men as Professor Marshall, Charles Booth, Samuel Barnett and others to look toward measures that might inspire hopefulness instead of fear. Schaeffle and other economists used the same argument in pleading for the workingmen's insurance. It was said repeatedly "the older charity ideas are no longer adequate to the exigencies." An able and experienced member of the London school board told me, "My experience has forced me to believe that for the children of the poor and their proper maintenance an entirely new policy has got to come. At a certain level of poverty the steadiness of municipal action must take the place of a vacillating charity, and a certain standard of physical comfort must be assured or the whole object of education for such children goes for naught, besides the certainty that they will grow up physically unfit to be fathers or mothers." So strong a man as Dr. Hunter, member of Parliament for Aberdeen, writes powerfully in the April *Contemporary Review* to show that the orthodox idea about the superiority of indoor relief is hopelessly discredited upon the facts in England—discredited, that is, so far as it is supposed to be a solution of the problem. Very strong proof is given of the greater excellence at many points of outdoor relief. Dr. Hunter is one of the many converts to an old age insurance scheme, and like most of those who come to believe that the necessities for receiving charity at all may be largely met by such insurance, he argues like Gorst, Ackland, Chamberlain; like Constance, who has been called the Chamberlain of French politics, or like Depuy, or indeed, like each succeeding head of the French government.

This attitude of the shrewdest politicians is of special interest. If they are not absolutely disinterested they, at least, know the drift of opinion and set sail accordingly. But we have here the politician of the Constance and Chamberlain type, the economist, the statistician and many practical workers in charity uniting. They agree that the older forms of charity are now inadequate and must be remodeled. They also agree that much poverty and out-of-work are traceable not to the individual shortcoming alone, but to social and industrial conditions that are beyond the individual's control. At this moment your extreme democrat or socialist, if he knows the facts, can point to a body of most authoritative expert opinion which seems fairly to be on his side, and to considerable extent *is* on his side, and if we could only trace out the reasons why so many able men have grown sceptical of the old charity and are looking for quite other remedies, their changed opinions would be found owing chiefly to the fact that the demos has at last got a language of its own. Labor organizations, thousands of socialistic centres, an army of lecturers, and a very formidable press have finally got a sort of consistency of expression for that vague mass of feeling which has been growing with the democratic movement. The root passion of this movement is the longing for larger equality of opportunity, and the thing which seems to me of extreme practical significance is that a multitude of those who have intellectual influence of high order are already won to the belief that this which the demos demands is essentially just and should be listened to. The more socialistic view of charity and the unemployed is no longer confined to the proletariat. The *spirit* of its view is held by a most formidable list of authoritative names. The cravings and the half articulate thought at the bottom are at last supported and strengthened by imposing opinions at the top. The two will more and more work together in this question we are considering. When, with increasing heat and emphasis, we hear from socialist and trade-union groups, and even from college settlements: "Your

charity is an offence, and we will none of it," it will get a response so sympathetic from those whose names carry weight, as to add to that cry far greater effect. Now my claim is that for any right beginnings in this future problem of charity and the unemployed, this background of democratic sentiment must at every point be taken into account. It must be taken into account precisely as the English will eventually be forced to shape their Irish legislation more in accordance with the *mass of feeling* that prevails in Ireland. The learned Tory browbeats you with his technical difficulties with a given Home Rule bill. He does not, nevertheless, shake your confidence in the least that in some way Ireland must at last be ruled with more consideration for the kind of feeling which prevails among the people of Ireland. The plain fact is that with charity methods, and with the special question of the unemployed, democratic sentiment has so far developed; it has got such power of expressing that sentiment through the machinery of politics, that our question is new and quite other than it was. In saying this, I may be allowed to add that, personally the recognition of these more daring democratic or socialistic claims, seem to me not without threatening possibilities. After a good deal of rather intimate experience with "case work" under the Associated Charity methods, I know the sickening story of human weakness which follows so swiftly upon the removal of personal responsibility. I do not forget all the commonplaces of "self help." I know that Emerson's sentence, "Man is as lazy as he dares to be," is dismally true of a large proportion of those with whom our problem has to do. Not one of these things do I forget in saying confidently that the growth of democracy is forcing us on to measures which shall not be wholly out of sympathy with that democracy. The older charity method is aristocratic. It has been in the hands and under the guidance of the well-to-do. It has been, as truly as the tax systems, to considerable extent in the interests of the upper classes. The squire and the parson

have managed these things with fair success in the English parish in the past, but they cannot continue to monopolize charity administration for the simple reason that the democracy has too far developed in many of those parishes and is now angrily demanding its own part in such administration, as it has already begun to force its way upon the boards of guardians. As the English aristocracy before the reform bill was shocked, that "mere shopkeepers" should want to get into Parliament; as in turn the business men were indignant that mere laborers should ask for representation there, so the representatives of the ratepayers on the boards of guardians find food for surprise that workingmen should aim at such influence. It is said that the interests of the laborers are subserved best if the well-to-do classes do their charities for them. As has always been said by the class in possession of political power, to the excluded class, "you will be best served if we manage your politics for you."

We may safely take it for granted that the time has passed when one class, be they men or women, will longer accept this sort of advice; and it is the ever closer and closer alliance of politics with social questions which increases the hostility against charity administration which is so exclusively in the hands of the well-to-do. I am not theorizing about this hostility. I have spoken during the past year to many labor organizations, and everywhere this angry note against charity methods and against anything like charity for the unemployed makes itself felt. The reasons for this hostility are at bottom the stigma which has come to be associated with charity; the idea that charity, being voluntary, the recipients are supposed to be grateful for such helps, but even more the fact that the very respectable and well-conditioned people in the community administer the charities. Here is the arch offence. The traditional charity carries with it as a fatality a sense of distributing favors. It is a gift from success to failure, from superiority to apparent inferiority; from one who pities, to one who is an object of pity. We may



say that the demos is unreasonable in this, that his objections are irrational in the extreme. I will not defend him, but only assert the embarrassing fact that widely and deeply this rooted ill-will is there. I say further, that it is certain each year to increase, for the reason that socialistic agitation is increasing. This agitation will in future manufacture problems which would otherwise have no existence. I am confident that in years of average prosperity the same amount of agitation which we have had this year in Boston would have made a problem. Every city has in winter a large number of unemployed (like carpenters and masons). They expect to be idle three months. If we add to these the motley crowd that is always there, you have only to tell them often enough that society owes them work and a living to make them believe it. For four months there was not a night last winter in which this kind of teaching was not going on. As in European cities, it goes on uninterruptedly year by year. We shall not stop it in our own cities and, I repeat it, this agitation will *make a problem* simply by bringing the conditions of the problem *out to consciousness*. All the phrases of "our right to work," have literally been drilled into the heads of thousands of workingmen in Boston and several neighboring cities. It is a seed the fruit of which is a chronic question of the unemployed; and as with the charity problem of which it is a part, its shape and direction have been largely determined by a certain extreme democratic and socialistic sentiment which has come into touch with politics. The seventeen centres of the Associated Charities could last winter have met the exigency with incomparably more efficiency, than the city did by methods that were bungling, because no preparations had been made, nor any proper measure of the problem been taken. The investigation was utterly inadequate. The plan was in too wholesale a form to be managed properly. If the great Bedford street crowd could have been broken up into twenty small manageable groups; if above all, trained investigators

could have at once gone to work and the workers taken on as fast as investigation had done its work, far greater good would have been done. Yet I hear of no city that has done better than Boston, either with its street work or its sewing and patching.

The Associated Charities that could have done far better were not allowed to act. Why? Because at the points *where the question of the unemployed touched politics* the labor leaders and the politicians made themselves too strongly felt. Properly organized charity was disliked too much by those who represented, or wished to represent the unemployed, and on the other hand the officialism of the city was unprepared and untrained for the emergency. Anything like real success was thus impossible. Miscellaneous begging has thriven upon the situation, and one certain consequence in my opinion is a considerable degree of demoralization which will be felt in the future. In that future the distrust and ill-will toward ordinary charities is sure to deepen. Even if these charities *can* do better than the city, political affiliations touched by socialistic sentiment will not permit them to monopolize the control of such experiments as the unemployed. I believe distinctly that the day has passed when the well-to-do classes can alone manage these questions. The simple fact that the management is in such hands has at last come to excite such a force of sullen ill-will that the friction is too great. Representatives both of the leisure and working classes must get that education and sympathy which alone can come *by bearing together common responsibilities*.

It will not help us to find fault with this growing distrust, or to blame the demos for its enmity toward charity. If this enmity is a fact and if it is increasing, it can have but one cure. The scientific or systematized charity is grossly misunderstood by these enemies and will continue to be misunderstood until they are brought long and intimately into actual contact with the practical problems of organized charity. Its

principles are rational co-operation, systematized investigation and friendly visiting. It is not pedantry to-day that this is science applied to the problem. It is merely ordered knowledge infused by the proper spirit. Trade-unionist and socialist alike must accept what is essential in these principles just so far as they deal at all wisely with the question. How can this insight be learned? Only in one way, and that, by systematic experience in the application of these principles.

In work upon charity and the unemployed the next great step in charity work I believe to be this *democratizing* of its administration. It must come not only to teach the socialists and trade-unionists a very difficult lesson, it must come also if only to fill the gulf now widening between these groups, and official and voluntary charities. Socialists and trade-unionists will learn their lesson only so far as definite responsibilities are given them. This will imply what has already begun even in the Elberfeld system, paid service among a part of the visitors.

It is evident that with increased responsibility the most intelligent leaders of the London socialists are already learning this lesson. John Burns has said that when the socialists got power they would make short work with the dead-beat constituency. He has shown more and more interest in the work of the charity organization idea in his own district. They cannot deal with the confirmed beggar without such principles, nor is it possible for them to learn these principles except by taking upon themselves the actual burden of the administration work, *i. e.*, their part of it. Those of them who thus do the work will come to be the natural instructors of their fellows.

This democratizing of charity work must come slowly and above all not be unnaturally forced. If we understand that it is an ideal toward which we must work, opportunities will come, as they have already come to put women on boards of overseers. The Boston board is at this moment

doubled in strength and efficiency by the women upon it, yet it is but a few years since I heard this ridiculed by persons in authority as "absurd doctrinaire sentiment." The Boston committee for the unemployed had a fair chance to put one or two representatives of the trade-unions among its members. The refusal to do this resulted in much bitterness among the labor organizations. Here was the perfect opportunity to avoid such irritation and also to educate the labor representatives by giving them their share of the responsibility in dealing with the unemployed question. They were living in the midst of it and daily struggling with the problem and yet were allowed to have no part in directing the experiment. I am glad to have heard the distinguished president of the Boston Associated Charities admit that it was a mistake to keep these men from the committee.

Beside this cautious working toward a democratizing of charity administration, what may be said of more specific remedies for the future?\*

In answering the question, I shall keep as far aloof from any theorizing as possible; I shall have in mind merely the actual experience which the situation offers. And first, what was the chief blinding fact of that situation last winter? It was the fact that the whole mass with which the problem had to do was mixed hopelessly through and through with the professional beggar, the tramp and the dead-beat element; so confused by this element that no human ingenuity could

\*The remedies suggested may seem related to the unemployed rather than to the charity question. To the extent however that the agencies indicated prove efficient they will relieve the charity burden, as they will tend to classify groups so that the "genuine" unemployed—so far as possessed of any skill—will present relatively few difficulties. Alike for the workless and charity subjects the present despair is the kind of competition brought to the situation by the untaught, by those who live from hand to mouth, and especially by that large variety of tramp and beggar who accepts odd jobs when driven to it by chronic necessity. The slow democratizing of administration is perhaps even more necessary for any right handling of the unemployed than for objects of charity. Organized opinion among the working-people themselves will act upon their idlers far more powerfully than the opinion of the well-to-do. An English Socialist has said, "Your comfortable classes can get no leverage upon these fellows. Let the laborers themselves deal with them, and they can quickly weed out the parasite."

in the least tell what we were dealing with. The whole discussion, the public meetings, the advertising, made it the occasion for this dead-beat element to come to the front. It is not a matter of question that Boston, like every large city, has thousands of such in its midst.

I believe that the beginning of right thinking on this question is to understand once for all that no important step is possible until we take measures to separate the "beat" in all his forms from the honest and well meaning among those in need. Why, like the green bay tree, does the beat flourish among us? chiefly because the public chooses to support him, and why support him? because the public is wholly uncertain, when appeal for alms is made, whether the case is genuine or not. And the public will continue to give at the back door and upon the streets until it is convinced that the beggar has had a perfectly fair chance of work offered him. "I had rather give to five beats than turn off one worthy case," is what one hears from four-fifths of the well-to-do-classes, and so the tramp goes his way rejoicing and the professional beggar continues without let his calling. One sees clearly in all this that the first difficulty is in this unconvinced public opinion. No step will count that does not first reckon with this public opinion. It is for this reason that we are driven for remedies (1) to adequate organized *work tests*, not primarily to furnish work, but simply as tests. We may begin with the actual tests existing whether wood yards, laundries, street work, and so far add to them as fairly to meet the varying degrees of strength and weakness among those out of work. Tailoring and sewing work, thorough cleaning of the courts and alleys, etc., can certainly be so far organized as to constitute such tests. The evidence is very strong that voluntary associations alone cannot cope with the problem. The city must take part in such way as to allow competition between it and voluntary schemes. A certain requisite steadiness and uniformity can alone be secured by municipal control. On the other hand much of the best

work finally taken by the municipality is first tried and approved by the free initiative of individuals or voluntary associations. Nor need the city fear to admit the "right to work" if it retain the control of all conditions of place, wage, etc., under which work is given. It seems clear that for such work the "living wage" cannot be paid but something below even the market wage for kindred tasks. This may bring some conflict at first with the trade-unions, but as in the coming issue of the trade schools it is a conflict that has to be met and fought out. The chief part of these applicants will not, however, be members of labor organizations, and the trade-unions do not waste sympathy on "scabs." Another condition of these tests is that the unemployed be ultimately distributed in such relation to the demand and supply of work as to include not merely towns but country districts.

It goes without saying that if the "right to work" be granted, the conditions of that right cannot be set by those who demand the work. It reduces to an absurdity if we say, "You shall have work *where* you want it, you shall have just the *kind* of work you wish, you shall have the *wage* you wish." The demand now is to work in cities because the excitements are there, and the country is tedious. It appears thus evident that in this first step of organizing tests, centres of information about employment should (as in Berlin) be organized in country and city in relation to each other. No new institution need be started for this. The police station in the city could in the beginning do service.

I am aware that bureaus of information have not accomplished what was expected of them, but no conceivable reason exists why they should reach important results until they become organized with tests and with such educational and disciplinary agencies as will make the bureau a necessity instead of being, as it now is, an unrelated thing. If understood that those out of work could register name, condition and address as early as they would, time enough would be

given for thorough investigation of each case. We may be certain that, with the classified information already at hand, this would weed out at the very start, before the pressure were upon us, a very large proportion of the most perplexing cases, exactly as a perfectly fair work test will drive four-fifths of the tramps out of any town or state. We should then have left, what has been called the "remnant of the genuine." With this remnant I believe we are perfectly competent to deal, if we have anything like the development of industrial and trade schools that other countries are getting. Here is a grievous want. Among the great majority is an appalling lack of even the beginning of any kind of skill. The skillless workman in the age of highly developed industry is, especially in cities, at a terrible disadvantage.\* He can produce nothing for which market value exists; nothing for which there is a real want. Can it be too soon understood that this large class, which our chaotic immigration swells to such unwieldy proportions, cannot be supplied with *made work* except at ludicrously extravagant expense?

I pit the Boston experiment upon the whole against any of which I have heard and yet, if superintendence and rent were counted in, I am convinced that street work, men and women's sewing work counted together would give a result like that of putting into one end of a machine dollars and getting out at the other end possibly thirty cent pieces. Some sewer work paid better simply because fit men were deliberately selected for the purpose, but the whole \$100,000 expenditure was a frightful waste, the sole excuse of which

\* There are no names of higher authority than those (like Siemens, Playfair, Galton) who hold that there is a kind of inevitableness in the present supply of material for charity subjects and the unemployed. The rapidity and the vast scale upon which science and invention are being applied, with the consequent demand for greater skill, vigor and enterprise among employers and laborers alike, throws upon the weak a strain too great to be met. A pace is set which they cannot follow. If we add to this that these are often gathered in cities where the centres of organized vice—dance-house, saloon, gaming—do upon such forced idlers a very deadly work, we see that the supply of material for charity and the unemployed is constantly renewed.

was the character of the exigency for which no sort of adequate preparations were made. It was early so evident that the result was to be failure that a few of us determined that careful statistics should be gathered as to nationality, trade, condition of family, time out of work, etc., for the purpose of having something to guide us in the future. Light will be thrown upon a few vital points, only one or two of these here concern us. It is quite probable that some 15,000 more than usual were out of work. If these were out of work as was claimed some four months, it would require the organization of work for which more than one and a half millions of money must be paid. This at least shows the magnitude of the problem of "furnishing work," but put beside this the actual achievement the almost ludicrous result.

Perhaps half this 15,000 have had work given them, but how long? I believe less than *two weeks*. Large numbers got but a single shift of three days; a very large number but two shifts during the entire winter. Is this less than far-cical? Think of the aroused expectation and the consequent disappointment. It is hardly conceivable that if no inducements had been held out of city employment, these people would not, upon the whole, have themselves found more work than the average of them got. Two or three thousand were made bitter by the emptiness of the result, and the citizens who sent them, thinking that all had a right to the fund, were quite as indignant. When the facts are clear we shall see a little better what it means to furnish anything like adequate work for a large mass of men and women, most of whom are practically unskilled.

Is it then to be doubted that industrial and trade schools must become a part of this problem? A large proportion of these unskilled were young enough to learn. I repeat, the one thing we cannot afford to do is to patch up work for the unskilled. It is turning dollars into thirty-cent



pieces.\* First, let us have, in country and city, bureaus of information, so that applicants can be investigated before there is undue haste or pressure. Second, organized graded work tests† that shall show us (*a*) those who do not propose to work (*b*), the capacity, skill or lack of skill which the applicant possesses.

For the capable among these, work can be found (except in extreme depression) if demand in the country is organized with city sources. For those who have learned to do nothing for which society will pay, what fit or hopeful place is there but some form of training school, whether forestry, farm colony or trade school? If it is said "they will not go to such school," my reply is that social responsibility is then, for such cases, at an end, as society has done its duty in finding a girl a decent place in the country. They often refuse to leave the city, but I maintain that we cannot for an instant admit that it is our duty to furnish work *in any one locality*.

The final question remains, What of the tramp and all his kind, whose pretence of seeking work is but a form of begging? What of those who have been offered work and refused it? To the extent that public opinion can be slowly won to it, I see but one answer. All such must be put upon a penal farm colony or into a training school, but in either case as much under constraint as if they were in prison. There shall be, however, this difference, that they shall be given an absolutely fair opportunity to work their way out by proving two things—first, that they *can* do something useful, and second, that they *will* do it. If they continue to refuse both, then there is more reason why they should be kept under

\*While this paper was in press a reply to inquiries in Holyoke, Mass., was received, in which it appears that a quite careful estimate was made of the market value of certain work done by the unemployed. It is believed that the men earned "less than thirty cents in every dollar they were paid." This was, of course, due in part to the necessary substitution of hand for machine work. It also appears that in 533 days' work given, each person got but seven days.

† These tests, to be in the least fair, must be in such variety as to gauge at least the *willingness* to work, and also to avoid asking impossible tasks of those whose habits of work have unfitted them for heavy, rough work.

constraint than in the case of an insane person. Socialists affirm that society is to blame for the tramp. This is possible, but it is not a question of blame, but of social danger. We do not blame the insane but shut them up, because they are socially unsafe. I submit that the most superficial study of the tramp question and that of the chronic beggar generally, in their effects upon social life leaves no doubt that any kind of handling of our problem, so long as they are mixed bewilderingly together with the worthy and hopeful: those I mean who have at least good-will, and for whom something can be done—so long as nine-tenths of the citizens cannot in the least distinguish between these hopeful elements on the one side and the despairing ones on the other, we are blocked from taking even the first steps toward a rational dealing with this problem of charity and the unemployed. This dead-beat crowd by any test that we apply to it is our greatest plague. Indirectly its expense is incomparably greater than all the disciplinary measures I am proposing. But when this crowd is considered in its relation to that part of the population question which furnishes us the constant stream of the undervitalized and unfit, we see that no real gain is possible until these sources of our trouble are reached. The three great passions—the sexual, gaming and drink are furnished in our cities such occasion for mischief as the world has not seen. The brothel, gambling and the saloon are organized into such formidable enticements and on so vast and various a scale, that they work in the deadliest conceivable way upon this class which makes our difficulty. Here the stuff for charity and the unemployed is manufactured as cloth in a mill. What a comment upon our intelligence that Massachusetts should allow 8000 feeble-minded girls to be loose in the community breeding their kind, instead of humanely and kindly shutting them up. The tramp and professional beggar in every form is quite as distinct a danger to society, and as fruitful of recruits for charity and the unemployed.

To the extent that immigration is furnishing us with creatures of this type, it is, of course, a source of the same mischief and should be dealt with as such. May I repeat—

(1.) *Employment bureaus* distributed over county and city districts with investigation so organized that it can do its work before it is too late to manage the applicants.

(2.) *Adequate graded work tests* that shall convince the public that the applicant has been taken fairly at his word and offered what he claims to be seeking,—work. Such work tests separate the beat in every variety from those for whom something may be done, because of the will to do something.

(3.) *Trade schools* (agriculture included) to which those can be sent who have accepted the tests and proved their *willingness*, but lack of skill and capacity.

(4.) Places of discipline and training (farm colonies and workshops), to which those who are able, but deliberately refuse to work, can be sent as to a prison, where they shall be kept until they prove their willingness and ability to earn an honest livelihood.\*

If slowly and cautiously we were to work our way toward an organization of these four measures, that should become part of a common discipline, it seems to me fair to hope that we should begin to act upon public opinion so as to secure its co-operation. The public does not now believe that the luckless and unfortunate is given a fair chance to work and therefore it supports him as a beggar. When the public knows that fair tests have been refused it will be prompt to

\* Every whit of evidence from the Belgian, Holland and German labor colonies shows that *compulsion* must have far larger use. The very fact that such persons are at least chronic idlers proves that they will not freely submit themselves to that degree of discipline which is necessary to create the habit and capacity of work. The evidence is overwhelming that if it is once admitted that such men and women should be put upon colonies or into shops, compulsion is a necessity. This admission of constraint does not imply, except for the refractory cases, harsh treatment in any form. Any degree of freedom and fair dealing may be allowed which is consistent with that degree of *training* which the case demands.

refuse its doles. I believe further that the effect of these measures will tend toward such lessening of the evil at its sources as to leave us eventually, not without a problem, but one with which our devotion and intelligence may cope with fair promise of success.

JOHN GRAHAM BROOKS.

*Cambridge, Mass.*